



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/735,470

12/12/2003

Anand R. Kumar

717841.4

4313

27128 7590 01/19/2011

HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP
190 Carondelet Plaza
Suite 600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63105

EXAMINER

PRESTON, JOHN O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3691

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/19/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto-sl@huschblackwell.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/735,470	Applicant(s) KUMAR ET AL.	
	Examiner JOHN O. PRESTON	Art Unit 3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43 and 46-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43 and 46-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 43 and 46-54 were presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on August 17, 2010. Claims 46-54 were added. Claims 1-42 and 44-45 were canceled. Claim 43 was amended. The examiner establishes new grounds of rejection for claims 43 and 46-54. Since the new grounds of rejection were necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claim(s), the rejection of claim 43 and 46-54 is a final rejection of the claim(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 43 and 46-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagan (US 2001/0056362 A1) and in view of Brown (6,385,652).

Claim 43: In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- (1) a navigation window, providing a tree display of options for access to a plurality of informational items relating to servicing a focus customer, (Brown: col 4, lines 55-67)
- (2) a search window providing search access to said informational items, (Hanagan: pgh 81)
- (3) an alert window providing pre-configured notifications to the customer service representative (Hanagan: pgh 168)
- (4) a summary area providing synopsis of said informational items, and (Hanagan: pgh 137)
- (5) a content area providing details of said informational items; and (Hanagan: pgh 313)

Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitations. However, Brown suggests:

- a customer care computing system having a memory, an operating system and a processor and further having an executable customer care application operably stored thereon said memory where said customer care application is operable to control the computing system when executed by said processor, to access customer care data relating to general customer data and management data and generate a graphical user interface having a navigation scheme operable to provide a single point of entry user interface where customer information and account information is continuously in view; said single point of entry graphical user interface comprising user interface functions including, (Brown: col 10, lines 35-60)
- where said customer care application of said customer care computing system provides the single point of entry user interface to handle said user interface functions utilizing an integrated group of data repositories which define an element of a graphical user interface and a function of the element and where said integrated group of data repositories include a user interface

(UI) repository, a data binding repository and a screen repository where said repositories are linked to various object oriented applications executed at runtime of the customer care application thereby performing data binding, field definition and screen arrangement in order to provide the single point of entry graphical user interface. (Brown: col 10, lines 35-60)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately with predictable results.

Claim 46: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 43.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

- wherein said care system includes preconfigured links and relationships among one or more screens of said care system and further comprising: (Hanagan: pgh 77)
- a functional option to set aside one or more work areas, wherein said set aside option preserves a first set of tasks or features being utilized by said customer service representative, during the performance of a second set of tasks or features. (Hanagan: pgh 78)

Claim 47: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 43.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

- a hierarchy component for classifying the system representation of one or more service items that relate to one or more accounts of a customer; means for utilizing said classification to organize, present and access information pertaining to said service items; and (Hanagan: pgh 77)
- an integrated user interface component to present and access information pertaining to said service items, wherein said integrated user interface

provides a navigational display for accessing said one or more service items.

(Hanagan: pgh 54)

Claim 48: In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- (1) a billing information component, (2) an account management component,
- (3) an equipment management component, and (4) an integrated user interface; (Hanagan: pgh 22-44; 415)

Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitations. However, Brown suggests:

- a customer care computing system having a memory, an operating system and a processor and further having an executable customer care application operably stored thereon said memory where said customer care application is operable to control the computing system, when executed by said processor, to access customer care data relating to general customer data and management data and generate a graphical user interface having a navigation scheme operable to provide a single point of entry user interface where customer information and account information is continuously in view; said single point of entry graphical user interface comprising user interface functions including, (Brown: col 10, lines 35-60)
- where said customer care application of said customer care computing system provides the single point of entry user interface to handle said user interface functions utilizing an integrated group of data repositories which define an element of a graphical user interface and a function of the element and where said integrated group of data repositories include a user interface (UI) repository, a data binding repository and a screen repository where said repositories are linked to various object oriented applications executed at runtime of the customer care application thereby performing data binding, field definition and screen arrangement in order to provide the single point of entry graphical user interface. (Brown: col 10, lines 35-60)

Art Unit: 3691

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately with predictable results.

Claim 49: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 48.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

- wherein said integrated user interface is customer centered and providing interaction between a customer service representative and said billing component, said account management component, and said equipment management component; (Hanagan: pgh 48)
- said billing component providing access to billing information of a customer and the charges associated with one or more services provided to one or more accounts of said customer (Hanagan: pgh 415)
- wherein said one or more accounts are managed and setup utilizing said account management component; and (Hanagan: pgh 165)
- said equipment management component providing information and access relating to any one or more equipment items associated with providing said one or more services to said customer. (Hanagan: pgh 79-81)

Claim 50: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 49.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

- wherein said work management component provides and receives information from said customer service representative relating to one or more tasks that are to be provided by a service provider. (Hanagan: pgh 79-81)

Claim 51: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 50.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

Art Unit: 3691

- wherein said work management component further manages work flows and work queues associated with said one or more tasks. (Hanagan: pgh 81)

Claim 52: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 51.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

- wherein said management of work flows entails categorizing of said one or more tasks by assignment, output for end user interaction, and system functions including process initiation or application launching. (Hanagan: pgh 81)

Claim 53: In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan suggests:

- (1) a service order component, (2) a service agreement component, (1) a payment collection and adjustment component, and (3) a customer centric user interface; (Hanagan: pgh 22-44; 415)

Hanagan does not teach the remaining limitations. However, Brown suggests:

- a customer care computing system having a memory, an operating system and a processor and further having an executable customer care application operably stored thereon said memory where said customer care application is operable to control the computing system, when executed by said processor, to access customer care data relating to general customer data and management data and generate a graphical user interface having a navigation scheme operable to provide a single point of entry user interface where customer information and account information is continuously in view; said single point of entry graphical user interface comprising user interface functions including, (Brown: col 10, lines 35-60)
- where said customer care application of said customer care computing system provides the single point of entry user interface to handle said user interface functions utilizing an integrated group of data repositories which define an element of a graphical user interface and a function of the element

and where said integrated group of data repositories include a user interface (UI) repository, a data binding repository and a screen repository where said repositories are linked to various object oriented applications executed at runtime of the customer care application thereby performing data binding, field definition and screen arrangement in order to provide the single point of entry graphical user interface. (Brown: col 10, lines 35-60)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the elements cited in Hanagan with the elements as taught by Brown because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately with predictable results.

Claim 54: Hanagan/Brown teaches the limitation(s) as shown in the rejection of claim 53.

In regard to the following limitation, Hanagan further suggests:

- wherein said service order component, said service agreement component, and said payment and adjustment component interfaced to said customer centric user interface; and said customer centric user interface providing a hierarchical relationship between a customer, an account and an agreement for providing customer care and managing customer related operations. (Hanagan: pghs 77-86)

Conclusion

- 4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event of a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the

Art Unit: 3691

date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **John Preston** whose telephone number is **571.270.3918**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI** can be reached at **571.272.6771**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Customer Service Window:

Randolph Building

Application/Control Number: 10/735,470
Art Unit: 3691

Page 10

401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

/John O Preston/
Examiner, Art Unit 3691
January 6, 2011

/Kelly Campen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691